Remarks

The above amendment and the following remarks place this Application in a condition for Allowance. Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 16-36 are pending in the application, with claims 16, 20 and 21 being the independent claims. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 16-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0123452 to Cox et al. (herein "Cox"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and provide the following arguments to support patentability.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claim 16 as amended is patentable over the art of record. For example, as will be described in more detail below, Cox does not teach or suggest at least the feature of "a third memory device, the third memory device including instructions for applying either the first sets or the second sets of binary patterns to the associated identifier assigned to the field of the incoming packet" as recited by claim 16.

According to Cox, the network processor parse tree program matches parsed values against pattern tree data structure, i.e., the first set of binary patterns, to obtain virtual handles and then matches the virtual handles against ordered virtual tree data

structure, i.e., the second set of binary patterns, to obtain destination identification values. (*see*, Cox, para. [0034]). Thus, as previously argued in the communication filed on June 25, 2007, Cox applies both the first set of binary patterns and the second set of binary patterns. (*see*, Amendment and Reply Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111, filed June 25, 2007, Page 8).

The Examiner argued in the final Office Action that Applicant's "claim as written does not prohibit the application of both sets of binary patterns." (*see*, Office Action, page 4). Applicant submits that claim 16 as written recited that only one of the set of binary patterns were applied. Nevertheless, claim 16 has been amended to recite the term "either" to more clearly distinguish Cox. The term "either" means one or the other (but not both). Thus, the third memory device, as recited in claim 16, includes instructions for applying either the first set of binary patterns *or* the second set of binary patterns to the associated identifier but *not both* the first set of binary patterns and the second set of binary patterns as taught or suggested by Cox. Therefore, Cox does not teach or suggest at least the feature of "a third memory device, the third memory device including instructions for applying one of the first sets or the second sets of binary patterns to the associated identifier assigned to the field of the incoming packet" as recited by claim 16.

For the reasons discussed above, Cox does not teach each and every feature of claim 16. Consequently, Cox cannot anticipate claim 16. Dependent claims 17-20 are likewise not anticipated by Cox for the same reasons as discussed above and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Allowed Claims

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating the allowability of claims 21-36 in the Office Action.

Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance

Applicants note the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance presented on pages 3 through 4 of the Office Action. Applicants reserve the right to demonstrate claims 21-36 are allowable over the art made of record for further reasons related to any of their recited features. Applicants further contend that reservation of this right does not give rise to any implication regarding whether the Applicants agree with or acquiesce in the reasoning provided by the Examiner.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

Robert Sokohl
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 36,013

Date: 10\26\07

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600
729831_2.DOC

Atty. Dkt. No. 2875.1070001